

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested. By the present amendment claims 1, 2, and 16 have been amended.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicated that the foreign reference cited in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted May 29, 2009, namely, German Patent Application No. DE 10024303 was not accompanied by a concise explanation of relevance in English and, thus, was not considered by the Examiner. Attached hereto is an Information Disclosure Statement listing U.S. Patent No. 6,702,335, which claims priority to and corresponds with DE 10024303. Likewise, also listed is U.S. Patent No. 6,808,211, which claims priority to, and thereby corresponds with, previously submitted German Patent Application No. DE 10141315. DE 10024303 is relevant because it discloses a coupling device. DE 10141315 is relevant because it also discloses a coupling device. Since the U.S. Patents are in English, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider corresponding German Patent Application Nos. DE 10024303 and DE 10141315.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted October 8, 2009. During the Interview, the Applicants proposed amended claim language in order to attempt to overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner indicated that the proposed

amendments to the claims would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and render the application allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections under 35 U. S. C. §112

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, claim 1 was rejected because the recitation of the side section (22, 23) was deemed unclear. Claim 2 was rejected because the recitation of a releasing structure (18, 19) that is in accordance with the latching structure (26, 27) on the side sections (22, 23) was deemed unclear. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended in accordance with the telephone Interview conducted October 8, 2009. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claims 1-2 has been overcome.

Claim 16 was rejected because the recitation of substantially parallel was deemed unclear. The Examiner indicated during the telephone Interview that amending claim 16 to be consistent with the specification would overcome the rejection. Amended claim 16 recites that the sliding surfaces extend along both sides of the guide recesses. Support for this amendment can be found at Page 4, lines 22-24 and Fig. 1 of the specification. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claim 16 has been overcome. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112 has been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

/John R. Hlavka/
John R. Hlavka
Reg. No. 29,076

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL,
& TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 East Ninth Street, Suite 1700
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072
Customer No.: 26,294